REMARKS

Initially, applicants note that the Office Action Summary does not correctly reflect the contents of the Action. Specifically, the Summary identifies claims 15 and 16 as objected to, which they are not. Furthermore, the Summary fails to indicate that claims 12 and 15 are allowed, while claims 13 and 14 are objected to. Applicants assume that the inconsistencies are merely the result of typographical errors.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 12 and 15 are allowable, and that claims 13 and 14 contain allowable subject matter. Applicants have respectfully maintained claims 13 and 14 in their dependent form in light of the following remarks.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Stave (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,198) in view of Morifuji (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,157). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have previously argued that Morifuji does not disclose or suggest attaching a second leadframe and a semiconductor die to a same surface of a first leadframe. The Examiner has asserted that the broadest interpretation of the claim encompasses the device of Morifuji, in which similar components are mounted on opposite sides of a first leadframe. Accordingly, applicants have amended claim 11 to recite "a first leadframe, *having a first side and a second side, opposite the first side*; a second leadframe laminated to a portion of *the first side* of said first leadframe thereby providing a multi-layer laminated leadframe; a semiconductor die mounted to another portion of *said first side* of said first leadframe," (emphasis added) as suggested by the Examiner. Neither Stave nor Morifuji, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests such features.

Morifuji does not disclose an integrated circuit package having multiple leadframes, nor does the Examiner assert that Morifuji makes such a disclosure. Morifuji has only been relied on as disclosing a plurality of contact balls.

The Examiner has relied on Stave as disclosing the above quoted features of claim 11. Specifically, the Examiner has asserted that Stave discloses "a first leadframe 25; a second

leadframe 40 laminated to a portion of a surface of the first leadframe (e.g. back) in order to create a multi-layer laminated leadframe; a semiconductor 10 mounted to another portion of the surface of the first leadframe," citing Figure 1 of Stave.

While Stave may disclose a first leadframe 25 and a second leadframe 40 laminated to a portion of a side of the first leadframe 25, Stave does not disclose a semiconductor die mounted to ***the same side*** of the first leadframe 25. To the contrary, Stave discloses a semiconductor die 10 mounted to the ***opposite side*** of the first leadframe 25. Accordingly, the combination of Stave and Morifuji does not disclose all of the features of claim 11, which is therefore allowable.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Stave in view of Morifuji and Takekawa (U.S. Patent No. 4,714,952). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Takekawa, which was cited as disclosing coating the semiconductor die "with at least one of titanium, tungsten, gold, or a combination thereof for soldering," fails to overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Stave and Morifuji detailed above with respect to claim 11. Accordingly, claim 16, which depends from allowable claim 11, is allowable due at least to its dependency.

Applicants solicit an early action allowing the claims.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief, including extensions of time, and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. **618902001410**

Dated: October 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Adam Keser
Registration No. 54,217
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7301